AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Attached is a complete set of replacement drawings for Figures 1-6. The attached sheets of drawings includes changes to Fig. 1. This sheet, which includes Fig. 1-2, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 1-2. In Figure 1, previously omitted element 104, 108, and 112 have been added and the lines, numbers and letters have been corrected. In Figure 4, the margins, lines, numbers and letters have been corrected.

REMARKS

Claims 1-55 are pending in the present application. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,477,150 by Maggenti et al. (Maggenti, hereinafter), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,360,108 by Rogers (Rogers, herein after). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner that the combination of Maggenti and Rogers teaches the claimed subject matter, as also presented in the Applicant's previous response.

Specifically, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's statement that Rogers discloses *sending at least the suffix portion of the number corresponding to the second state to the calling party;*
comparing the number corresponding to the first state with the number corresponding to the second state; or
appending the prefix portion of the number corresponding to the first state with the suffix portion of the number corresponding to the second state."

Specifically, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner that Rogers discloses "*sending at least the suffix portion of the number corresponding to the second state to the calling party.*" Rogers discloses that "the user enters a partial destination telephone number. . . ." (Col. 4, lines 8-9 and Col. 5, lines 52-53), but nowhere is there any mention of a sending such partial telephone number to a calling party.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner that Rogers discloses "*comparing the number corresponding to the first state with the number corresponding to the second state.*" Since there is no mention in Rogers of the first and second states and the corresponding numbers, there is no mention of comparing such numbers, as there is no mention of requesting a change from a already established first state to a new second state. While Rogers discloses that the "system analyzes the destination number" (Abstract, lines 6-7), there is no need

13

or mention of comparing the two numbers, because Rogers deals with only one telephone number. The Examiner has stated that "*Rogers clearly discloses comparing the number corresponding to the first state or voice state with the number corresponding to the expected number of digits and appending the prefix portion of the number corresponding of the voice state with the suffix portion of the number corresponding to said sate.*" (Office Actoin of June 30, 2004, page 9, second line from bottom to page 10, line 3). However, this statement does not correctly address the claimed limitation, i.e., "*comparing the number corresponding to the first state with the number corresponding to the second state,*" again because there is no mention or presence of two numbers in Rogers.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner that Rogers discloses "*appending the prefix portion of the number corresponding to the first state with the suffix portion of the number corresponding to the second state.*" There is no mention in Rogers of the prefix portion of the number corresponding to the first state and the suffix portion of the number corresponding to the second state. On the contrary, Rogers discloses the "processor automatically pre-pends a first sequential one of the plurality of prefixes to the user-entered destination telephone number," (Col. 2, lines 4-7; See also Col. 5, lines 51-53 and Col. 4, lines 17-21). In sharp contrast to the claimed limitations, the prefixes referred to in Rogers are pre-stored in a prefix memory (See Col. 4, lines 14-15), rather than being taken from the first number corresponding to an already established first state, because there is no first number corresponding to a first state in Rogers. Therefore, since Rogers does not disclose at least the above limitations, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

Drawings

Applicants have amended the drawings to remove Examiner's objection. Applicant submits that the amendments to the drawings do not make any substantive changes or introduce any new material but are simply the correction of typographical errors, which are consistent with the specification as originally submitted. Therefore, approval and entry of the above amendments are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 15, 2004 By: *Abdollah Katbab*

Abdollah Katbab, Reg. No. 45,325
(858) 651-4132

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502

15